THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, DC

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON NOVEMBER 12, 1999, IN THE GELMAN LIBRARY, 6TH FLOOR READING ROOM

The meeting was called to order by President Trachtenberg at 2:15 p.m.

Present: President Trachtenberg, Vice President Lehman, Registrar Selinsky, and Parliamentarian Pagel; Deans Futrell, Lefton, Mazzuchi, Phillips, Riegelman, and Williams; Professors Agnew, Berkowitz, Boswell, Captain, Duff, Gallo, Granger, Griffith, Haque, Harrington, McAleavey, Mergen, Nagy, Paratore, Park, Pelzman, Robinson, Stephanic, Wilmarth, and Zaghloul

Absent: Deans Harding and Young; Professors Castleberry, Cawley, Johnston, Sheldon, and Simon

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of September 10, 1999, were approved as distributed.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

President Trachtenberg asked if there were any objections to changing the order of the agenda by taking up as the next item of business the update on the Medical Center, inasmuch as Vice President Katz had to leave the meeting early. No objections were made.

UPDATE ON MEDICAL CENTER BY JOHN (SKIP) WILLIAMS, VICE PRESIDENT FOR HEALTH AFFAIRS, AND DEAN, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE AND HEALTH SCIENCES, AND LOUIS H. KATZ, VICE PRESIDENT AND TREASURER

Vice President Williams spoke briefly about the current situation of the health care industry in the country and, specifically, in academic health centers. First, he noted that the Balanced Budget Amendment passed in 1997 was enacted to save Medicare some $103 billion over a five-year period. It is at a pace right now, he said, where Medicare will save $191.5 billion as a result. This affects not only hospitals, but it affects physicians and physicians' practices as Medicare dollars continue to decrease. Secondly, the advent of managed care and its ability to squeeze the amount of money that is paid to physicians has had a drastic effect on physicians' salaries. For example, any one of his primary care physicians who sees a patient receives about 35 cents on the dollar and this amount is dictated by managed care, usually in the form of a capitated contract. With regard to academic health centers nationally, Vice President Williams cited the losses incurred for example by the University of Pennsylvania ($198 million), University of Texas at Galveston ($110 million over 2 years), Georgetown University ($76 million, unaudited) and the downgrading of bond ratings of very strong institutions like Duke University, Washington Hospital Center, and many other institutions in the country. Locally, he noted that Greater Southeast Hospital, Columbia Hospital for Women, and Shady Grove

Adventist Hospital have all experienced severe financial difficulties. He said that probably what continues to haunt academic health centers is the fact that academic physicians' salaries continue to fall. This year, he noted that GW Medical Center has laid off 40 physicians in our Medical Faculty Associates, as well as decreasing salaries of our physicians that make their salaries much more at risk in terms of the numbers of patients they see. This puts our academic health center in a very tough position because we are trying to compete with private physicians who are seeing patients and seeing patients only, whereas our physicians are expected not only to see patients, but expected to teach and to do research as well.

Vice President Williams said that the Medical Center is taking both a short-term and long-term approach to these problems. Last year the Medical Center lost $38 million; this year, he said, the Medical Center intends to have a budgeted loss of only $12 million, and intends to decrease that to between $4 and $6 million in 2001. He then described some of the steps that are being taken to reorganize the Medical Center to make it more efficient without diminishing its quality. For example, developing new products that can be offered to patients in the marketplace could bring a significant amount of funds into the Medical Center. The Medical Center and Johns Hopkins have formed a limited liability corporation and have recently developed a management product that is being offered to physicians who treat patients with end-stage renal disease that would significantly reduce the cost of treating this disease from $80,000 to $40,000. The Medical Center has signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Howard University to reduce some of the duplication that exists in DC. The Medical Center has also embarked upon an "Urban Health Initiative" with the School of Medicine and the School of Public Health and Health Services. The Urban Health Initiative is in basic sciences, prevention, therapeutics, and diagnostics. In that regard the Medical Center has been awarded an Area Health Education Center grant that is worth $2 to $3 million a year to teach our medical students outside of tertiary care facilities. He said that we have secured $800,000 for an Upward Bound Program, the first such Program in the District in over a decade, and we have also applied for a minority medical education program which is worth over a million dollars a year for five years. We are also looking at a new model for medical education working with the Rand Corporation. Vice President Williams emphasized that we are a Medical Center that is not just thinking about its problems, but one that is actually doing something about them. We are moving forward to correcting our deficiencies by developing new revenue streams, but, he noted, we have an external environment that is quite ugly right now as far as health care is concerned. He then asked Vice President Katz to speak about some of the Board's commitments that have been made.

Vice President Katz said that this is an issue that the administration is treating very seriously, not only through the management of the institution, but also with our Board of Trustees. He noted that there has been active Board involvement on Medical Center issues dating back to 1995. He said that we have taken actions at this institution that were not necessarily popular, but have reduced the risk of this institution dramatically from those that other institutions are facing today. The administration started a strategic planning process with the Board in 1995 that led to the spin-off of our hospital which has helped us reduce the risk on the medical side. We have been working with the Board this summer, looking at a redefinition of medical education because it is necessary to build a structure that is supportable and sustainable with the dollars that are available in the current reimbursement environment. Vice President Katz explained that the administration has a plan put in place with the Board which includes deliverables and we are looking at all parts of the Medical Center -- from the clinical side to teaching, to research, to administration, and to overhead. And it is not just in the Medical Center; the administration is also looking at administrative overhead between the Medical Center and the University, and we have already combined several of the administrative areas between

the two. The Office of Information Technology has been combined with the ISS side at the University and the financial side has been consolidated also. He pointed out that the administration is monitoring the targets of the Medical Center on a daily basis, and for the first three months of this year, we are right on target with the benchmarks that were set. Vice President Katz said that we are doing things that we need to do to be in control over the environment that we are in, but the healthcare marketplace is a difficult marketplace now, but it is one that the University is committed to.

In reference to the $38 million loss, Professor Griffith asked which com

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Vice President Lehman called for approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of November 12, 1999. Professor Nagy asked that the minutes be amended on Page 3, Paragraph 1, Line 7, by replacing the words ". . . the CEO of AETNA pays himself $123 million a year. . ." with the words "according to USA Today, Thomas Frist, CEO of HCA, made a profit of $125.9 million on stock options in 1992. . . ." No objections were made to the amendment, and the minutes, as amended, were approved.

Vice President Williams replied that the Association of American Medical Colleges and the Association of Academic Health Centers have some very strong lobbying groups that are lobbying Congress right now, and we are trying to get the information out to the public because academic health centers have become the safety net for this country. We keep adding uncompensated care to our rolls and we are ill-equipped to do that, and unless the AETNA CEO's and others recognize this and try to help fund academic health centers, he said he personally believed that there will be a disaster in this country, and he urged those people living in Maryland and Virginia to contact their congresspeople and senators to let them know what is going on. Professor McAleavey asked about the actual state of the legislation on Capitol Hill at this point, and Vice President Williams replied that there is really no movement in the Congress right now.

SIXTH FLOOR READING ROOM, GELMAN LIBRARY

President Trachtenberg then asked University Librarian Jack Siggins to explain to the Senate the charms of the Sixth Floor Reading Room of Gelman Library. Mr. Siggins explained that the Senate was invited at the request of the President and he was pleased to have the Senate members here to see the remodeling that has taken place, not only of the Sixth Floor, but also the Seventh Floor. The purpose of remodeling this floor, he said, was to improve the environment for the students as a comfortable place to study, and, indeed, that is what they are doing. This room is the most popular room next to the 24-hour room, he noted. The President observed that there was some discussion last year about the Library budget and the University made a big investment to get itself into the American Association of Research Libraries. He hoped that we would not abandon that once we get there. Mr. Siggins indicated that we would not do so, and, in fact, with the addition of the Mount Vernon campus, as well as with the growth we have in this Library, our rating in comparison to other universities will go up. He said that the Library is moving ahead, and although it is not moving ahead in terms of increases in the base budget as substantially as he would like, he believed that the Library is making progress in improving its collections in every respect. The President noted that the Library should be approaching its 2 millionth volume, and Mr. Siggins said that we will in fact pass that figure at the end of this fiscal year and we will have a celebration of our 2 millionth volume that includes all the libraries. Professor Griffith said that he did not know whether the overall size of the Library budget is adequate or not, but in his experience he did not think the collections budget is adequate to

meet the needs of the kinds of students that we have who come in with advanced placement, ready to do more advanced work.

REPORT ON FINAL ENROLLMENT FIGURES BY DONALD R. LEHMAN, VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Vice President Lehman presented data on student enrollment as of the census date of October 31, 1999. Across the four undergraduate schools, including Mount Vernon, 2,094 freshmen have come to the University this year. In comparison to last year, we have 570 more full-time undergraduate students than we had last year. Of those, 332 are freshmen and 244 are students who are in the continuing group. At the Master's level, including the continuing students, we are down 102 students relative to budget. We basically remained neutral relative to budget at the doctoral level. With regard to off-campus sites, we met or exceeded budget as far as enrollments are relative to last year. He then described the enrollment figures at the individual schools. Overall, Vice President Lehman said that we have 713 more students at census relative to last year. He then offered to answer any questions the Senate might have about the enrollment figures. (Enrollment data are attached.)

President Trachtenberg asked Vice President Lehman how he would characterize the University - healthy, or not healthy? Vice President Lehman replied that he would characterize the undergraduate enrollment as being very healthy and very positive because we have an outstanding group of undergraduate students relative to their SAT scores, their class standing, etc. Where he would put a lot of caution, he said, is at the Master's level, especially on campus. He pointed out that the faculty deserve an enormous amount of credit for bringing in the Master's enrollments to meet projections, because it was not easy and it took a lot of hard work. At the doctoral level, things are in good shape, and off campus, things are very strong and very positive, he said.

PROPOSAL TO CREATE A NEW COLLEGE OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES BY DONALD R. LEHMAN, VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, AND ROGER WHITAKER, ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

With reference to the proposed College of Professional Studies, Vice President Lehman gave an overview of how he looked at this relative to the University overall. At this point in time, he said, he would argue that the University has basically two focuses, and these two focuses pretty much drive our academic programmatic directions. The first focus is on retaining and enhancing the name-brand status of GW as an institution, and that comes about in basically two ways. The first way is producing a first-rate academic experience for undergraduate students and providing them with excellent facilities to the extent our resources allow. Built on top of that is the effort to have top-ranked doctoral programs based on the research and scholarship of the faculty that is of Research I caliber. The second focus is the solidification and strategic expansion of offerings that are connected to the continuous learning market. While traditional Master's programs fall into the first focus category, e.g., the terminal programs, there are Master's programs in the continuous learning markets that are more oriented towards "commodity offerings." The difference is, in some respects, that they have to be packaged according to market needs. In some ways, this creates certain tensions in the University because we have a focus on "traditional education" and then a focus on "non-traditional education" which is commodity oriented. Vice President Lehman pointed out that the University has been in the continuing education business for a long time, and what is being proposed today is something that will enhance what the University is already doing, but in a more extensive way that in the long term will

benefit the traditional area with added resources. He then called upon Associate Vice President Whitaker to give the Senate an overview of the proposal.

Associate Vice President Whitaker said that he was sure that anyone familiar with the proposal for a new entity -- a new academic initiative -- was bound to provoke a variety of different and respected opinions, and that that was to be anticipated and welcomed. He said that his own sense of this proposal is that it is very credible, and he would even argue that a compelling case can be built to suggest that it is in the best interests of the University to develop a new academic unit, which is called at this point the "College of Professional Studies." He then offered the following three reasons:

(1) The first is revenue. I think there are great opportunities to leverage the intellectual assets of the University into new entrepreneurial opportunities, especially with various enabling technologies and the opportunity to address organizations and their various learning needs. And so I think that the proposal is built upon the assumption that one of the principal goals of this new unit will be to generate new resources for the University, and particularly for Academic Affairs. I also believe that can be done better with a new unit to supplement our existing practice than it could be done with our existing traditional methods of trying to address that marketplace. In that respect, one of the goals of this proposal will be shortly to elaborate a full financial model that would be submitted for review by the Board, and actually should be evaluated the same way a venture capital firm would look at an investment strategy-- is this sufficiently compelling from a financial point of view that the likelihood of return for this particular proposal should merit a commitment on behalf of the Board?

(2) Secondly is the area of reputation, and here I'll take a fairly unorthodox position. Some of the concern in the communities that I've spoken with so far is about branding. What happens to the reputation of the University if there's a new unit put into place that's externally focused, doing business to business relationship sales/consultative kinds of modeling? What happens to the brand name recognition of The George Washington University and its quality? And I think it's important to make some differentiation about what audiences we're talking about in terms of branding. When you talk about an undergraduate residential experience, when you talk about curiosity-based doctoral, highly funded kind of research, there's certain branding, and they leverage one off the other for sure. But in that area of continuing professional education in the marketplace, I would argue that we need to enhance our reputation, and what's at risk is not denigrating the brand name of The George Washington University, but, in fact, the opportunity to enhance it. Although we have some wonderful programs operating off-campus - nearly a third of our graduate students are there – and those are gems that we need to celebrate, I think if you were to go and talk to the High Technology Council in Montgomery County or the Roundtable in Northern Virginia, or Potomac Knowledgeway, or area corporations, or Associations or government agencies, and ask them what they think of GW's branding and their response to your organizational needs, or even ask the members of our Board of Trustees -- you would hear them say more often not: "unresponsive, no presence in the marketplace, uncoordinated,

unfocused, not responsive to the needs of my particular organization." And I think the opportunity is there, not to question the value of The George Washington George Washington University's reputation but, in fact, to enhance it, and brand it in that particular marketplace, in that particular segment.

(3) The third point I would say, in the sense of branding, if we look at some of the Market Basket Schools that have developed Schools of Professional Studies to do these kinds of things, I think in many respects they've complemented, rather than detracted, from the reputation of those universities. A case in point is NYU, a Research I institution, highly ranked in all of its fields, and yet has a $92 million operation called the School of Continuing Professional Studies. That's addressing the kind of local, regional, community needs of the university where it's embedded. Boston University's Metropolitan College, Johns Hopkins, with its newly-named School of Professional Studies in Business and Education. University of Maryland, University College, of course you're familiar with. And finally I would say in the area of relevance. The question is for the graduates of our own University and for the adults and their learning needs, and for the organizations in our own community, the relevance of The George Washington University addressing those needs can be enhanced with this new strategy. So the question becomes, if it's true that this is a credible venture for the University to consider doing, the next question is: " What is the strategy that is most likely to succeed or create conditions that will be favorable for its success?" And it's in this vein that we're talking about the proposal to create a new unit, much of which is already in place but which needs more coherence in terms of focus and purpose to its energies. And it would be a blended strategy that would have some time-honored mechanisms of quality assurance in terms of expert curriculum design, rigorous requirements, high quality of inputs in terms of students and faculty, and quality measurable outcomes. It would also have some new, less traditional structural mechanisms consistent with the mission of the unit. To have rapid development, delivery of programs and services clustered to address the needs, and professional development in the professional workplace.

Associate Vice President Whitaker then showed slides of a model which he said is clearly not fully elaborated, but it does show a concept of a kind of framework which invites the participation of schools, departments and faculty. In concluding his presentation, he offered to answer any questions the Senate might have.

Professor Boswell asked Associate Vice President Whitaker to expand briefly on what percentage of money would come back to academics because in the past development and off-campus work have been done on the back of the faculty and it has been a constant fight to get anything back to the schools. Associate Vice President Whitaker replied that if a school owns the intellectual property and has the expertise in a particular area and co-ventures in this kind of effort, the school ought to share in the revenues that come from that kind of success. Individual faculties that take ownership as lead faculty in some of these programs could perhaps share in that revenue, and certainly there would be efforts for the success of the unit to have earmarked its contributions back to academic affairs for use. President Trachtenberg commented that the decision about how to distribute the resources would be a University decision made undoubtedly outside of the school itself. If one looks at what Columbia University has done in the last few years, they have become the preeminent school in the United States

in the generation of income through copyrights, patents, and other intellectual property generated by faculty, which is then licensed. Last year their income from that source was $1 billion. The formula for the distribution of the $1 billion was 25% to the principal investigators, 25% to the department, and 25% to the school, and 25% to the President, who then reinvested that 25% into areas of the University, such as the humanities and soft social sciences programs, that did not have the capacity to generate patents and copyrights in the normative sense.

Professor Nagy pointed out that the Senate has heard a radical proposal upon which it is asked to decide, but he saw no budget, no estimate of costs, and no estimate of the impact on other programs or resources. Another concern, he said, is whether this unit can be called a "college" at all because in viewing the organizational chart, it appears that faculty do not have real participation or control in quality assessment. A further concern, he added, is that it seemed to him from the presentation that this proposal was headed straight to the Board, and he hoped that that did not imply that the Faculty Senate does not have a vote on something that is proposing to offer semester hour credits. Professor Robinson responded that the Executive Committee would be appointing an ad hoc committee to study this proposal and that she assumed that it would come back to the Senate with a report.

Professor Pelzman said that he was concerned about quality. He saw no problems with our faculty doing "demand driven" teaching, but he did see a problem when we hire adjuncts en masse when the quality is questionable, where there is no governance, and where resources are being taken away. He said that our departments could do this and our individual faculty members could do this, as well. And he thought there is a concern about a conflict of interest. There are many faculty members who do a lot of consulting for government agencies and corporations, teaching courses that may be viewed as competing with the same courses being offered by the proposed College of Professional Studies, so there are a series of those kinds of considerations. Associate Vice President Whitaker replied that we are going to have to be driven by the best faculty we can find. And if that implies that we need to have a threshold of full-time faculty to meet the norm of what we do with our current off-campus practice, that would seem to him to be a respectful discussion. He stressed that it is not going to be done on the back of inexpensive adjuncts because there is no value in that. Professor Duff commented that he thought it would make better sense to put more money into the schools that can do this rather than spread ourselves more thinly, since we already have the mechanism and we have an administration, and setting up an entirely different administration would take more classroom space. Associate Vice President Whitaker explained that this will not take any classroom space since it is an externally focused effort that would use most of our off-campus facilities. But to try to build that kind of core infrastructure within the Schools would seem to him to be a waste of resources.

Further discussion followed by Professors Berkowitz, Pelzman, Griffith, Nagy, Vice President Lehman, and Associate Vice President Whitaker.

Professor Griffith said that it seemed to him that this is a very important venture and the Senate ought to give as much advice as it can. He recommended that the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee and the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee both be asked to review this proposal with respect to the budget and governance issues, respectively. Professor Robinson replied that Professor Griffith's recommendation would be considered by the Executive Committee in its appointment of the ad hoc committee, and that she expected that would be members from those two standing committees on the ad hoc committee.

Professor Wilmarth, having read the entire package, said that various schools within the University already have off-campus programs in professional education, but they are not very well-

coordinated. The idea of building a superstructure that would help the schools coordinate these programs made a lot of sense to him. However, he was more skeptical about the idea of building an entirely new unit that appeared likely to compete with what we already are doing quite successfully. Secondly, Professor Wilmarth said that the information that is greatly lacking in the document is what the proposed cost will be, what the budgets will be for the next 3 to 5 years, and what would happen to our existing programs. To get this information to the Senate and then to expect the Senate to approve the proposal before the Board of Trustees meets in February struck him as exceptionally ambitious, and he thought this proposal had come to the Senate very late in the day. Associate Vice President Whitaker explained that the next phase of this proposal would elaborate the financial model that would be shared with the ad hoc committee that is being formed. His sense of the University's current off-campus activity is that it is on an incremental growth strategy and he has seen the projections that the deans have put in this year and in most cases they are flat or lowered from what we are doing. He thought that the University is faced with a need for a breakthrough performance strategy because of the demands on the University to create resources to keep up with some very ambitious goals of the University and to try to create new resources for academic affairs. This requires continuing to work with the existing departments and programs that are doing well, but it also needs to have enthusiasm about creating new ways of expanding that business, and he did not think that incremental growth strategies are going to do it. The President commented that the administration is hearing from the Board that we are perhaps not being responsive in this regard and it is the view of some that we may be coming with "too little too late."

Professor Gallo said that she favored the proposal although the concerns that have been raised are not trivial. She noted that there are a number of universities that are doing this very successfully and that we might learn something from those models in resolving the concerns. She then asked Associate Vice President Whitaker if he has had any opportunity to make any kind of projection about how profitable this venture could be. He replied that a projection has not been done yet, but that that will be in the next phase. There are certain conventions about the margins that these ventures generate and we will try to match the industry standard for that, he said. Professor Berkowitz pointed out that it seemed to him that there is a long history of these profit-making ventures at GW and they actually cost a lot more than one thinks, so we have to know up front if this will be profitable or not.

Professor Park said that it seemed to him that this project has a lot of advantages to the faculty, as well as to the University, because it has a format that will provide the faculty with better marketing of the advanced degree and continuing education products that they are offering. As the President suggested with the Columbia University model, he said that the faculty would have a stake in the success of the project, and he thought that many faculty would be very pleased to take advantage of the centralized administration to relieve themselves of the administrative overhead and the marketing problems, etc. Professor Paratore noted that there was not much discussion about the academic structure and he asked whether or not the unit would offer its own degree. Associate Vice President Whitaker replied that it would have a distinct degree, like a Master's of Professional Studies, so that there is no confusion about an MA or MS degree. And then concentrations under that degree would move in and out according to market expectations. In order to be successful, he said that the unit needs to have the ability to control some of its own content in degrees and in graduate certificates. Professor Griffith urged the Faculty Senate to look extremely closely at any proposal that suggested that a unit of this kind would actually offer a GW degree if there would not be a duly constituted faculty who would be responsible for that degree. The President then thanked Associate Vice President Whitaker for his presentation.

GENERAL BUSINESS:

I. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Report of the Executive Committee by Professor Robinson, Chair, is enclosed.

II. INTERIM REPORTS OF SENATE COMMITTEE CHAIRS

No Interim Reports were given.

III. TRIBUTES

Tributes for former Faculty Senate members who recently retired were offered, as follows: On behalf of Professor Pelzman, the President read a tribute to Charles F. Elliott, Associate Professor of Political Science and International Affairs, and Professor Linda Gallo read a tribute to David Lynn Atkins, Professor of Biology. (The tributes are attached.)

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

President Trachtenberg spoke about the University's efforts to have the DC City Council and the Mayor endorse some industrial revenue bonds for about $350 million. He said that the Mayor recommended it and the City Council recently approved it, and Vice President Katz, himself, and others have been meeting with people from Standard & Poor, and Moody's to try to bring the bonds to market and to establish a grade for the bonds. He stressed that this is not all new money but that it is a roll-up of all of our previous debt, and once it all settles down, the outcome of it ought to save us about $3 million a year on interest payments on our debt. It will also provide us a fixed, rather than a variable rate.

Professor Paratore said that his faculty are concerned about the elimination of the dial-in PINE (e-mail) system as of January since they now would be forced to purchase Internet services in order to dial in. Vice President Lehman noted that there are free Internet service providers. However, he said that when one uses an Internet service provider, it drops off the "edu" part of the address and because of that, Mr. David Swartz, Chief Information Officer, is working now to find a solution to that problem. The reason that the modem pool is being closed down is because it is not Y2K compliant and it is very expensive to maintain. He suggested that any faculty who have a problem delivering a course owing to the elimination of the modem pool should contact Mr. Swartz as soon as possible.

Professor Paratore then asked about the claim that the University had an opportunity to buy into some possible Metro discounting, but did not take advantage of it. President Trachtenberg responded that he was not aware of this, but that he would ask someone to look into it.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made and seconded, President Trachtenberg adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Brian Selinsky

Brian Selinsky
Secretary

FALL 1999 ON-CAMPUS ENROLLMENTS as of 10/01
Census
IR 10/03/99 rev 10/5/99
[enrollmt]

(10/01/99)

		1996	1997	1998 as of census				1999 Projection for Budget				1999 To Date				1999 To Date Vs. Budgeted				1999 To Date Vs. 1998 Census			
UNDERGRADUATE		TOTAL	TOTAL	FRESH	TRANS	CONT	TOTAL	FRESH	TRANS	CONT	TOTAL	FRESH	TRANS	CONT	TOTAL	FRESH	TRANS	CONT	TOTAL	FRESH	TRANS	CONT	TOTAL
FT	CSAS	3,613	3,770	1,114	123	2,568	3,805	1,351	141	2,594	4,086	1,344	125	2,702	4,171	(7)	(16)	108	85	230	2	134	366
	SEAS	442	459	93	12	321	426	144	17	298	459	94	19	294	407	(50)	2	(4)	(52)	1	7	(27)	(19)
	SBPM	910	995	248	48	783	1,079	265	59	844	1,168	303	34	866	1,203	38	(25)	22	35	55	(14)	83	124
	ESIA	956	995	307	30	738	1,075	315	33	791	1,139	353	29	792	1,174	38	(4)	1	35	46	(1)	54	99
	TOTAL	5,921	6,219	1,762	213	4,410	6,385	2,075	250	4,527	6,852	2,094	207	4,654	6,955	19	(43)	127	103	332	(6)	244	570
PT	CSAS	175	151	8	14	129	151	8	13	120	141	2	5	137	144	(6)	(8)	17	3	(6)	(9)	8	(7)
	SEAS	78	61	2	1	54	57	2	1	50	53	3	1	43	47	1	0	(7)	(6)	1	0	(11)	(10)
	SBPM	81	64	2	3	57	62	2	2	53	57	4	10	49	63	2	8	(4)	6	2	7	(8)	1
	ESIA	40	29	1	3	27	31	1	3	28	32	1	0	22	23	0	(3)	(6)	(9)	0	(3)	(5)	(8)
	TOTAL	374	305	13	21	267	301	13	19	251	283	10	16	251	277	(3)	(3)	0	(6)	(3)	(5)	(16)	(24)
GRADUATE		TOTAL	TOTAL		NEW	CONT	TOTAL		NEW	CONT	TOTAL		NEW	CONT	TOTAL		NEW	CONT	TOTAL		NEW	CONT	TOTAL
MASTERS	CSAS	726	788		287	389	676	*	359	364	723		359	395	754		0	31	31		72	6	78
	GSEHD	439	434		167	241	408		193	224	417		164	231	395		(29)	7	(22)		(3)	(10)	(13)
	SEAS	698	569		107	322	429		132	298	430		137	293	430		5	(5)	0		30	(29)	1
	SBPM	1,347	1,409		639	970	1,609	**	651	988	1,639		515	1,054	1,569		(136)	66	(70)		(124)	84	(40)
	ESIA	564	554		222	287	509		217	245	462		203	268	471		(14)	23	9		(19)	(19)	(38)
	VPAA	0	0		0	0	0		50	0	50		0	0	0		(50)	0	(50)				
	TOTAL	3,774	3,754		1,422	2,209	3,631		1,602	2,119	3,721		1,378	2,241	3,619		(224)	122	(102)		(44)	32	(12)
DOCTORAL	CSAS	547	576		150	426	576		143	425	568		152	447	599		9	22	31		2	21	23
	GSEHD	208	194		56	161	217		50	180	230		35	179	214		(15)	(1)	(16)		(21)	18	(3)
	SEAS	404	373		34	339	373		37	336	373		44	322	366		7	(14)	(7)		10	(17)	(7)
	SBPM	114	124		21	88	109		23	93	116		19	88	107		(4)	(5)	(9)		(2)	0	(2)
	TOTAL	1,273	1,267		261	1,014	1,275		253	1,034	1,287		250	1,036	1,286		(3)	2	(1)		(11)	22	11
LAW	FT JD	1,284	1,219		415	756	1,171		407	744	1,151		408	807	1,215		1	63	64		(7)	51	44
	PT JD	212	214		75	162	237		65	178	243		94	144	238		29	(34)	(5)		19	(18)	1
	Post JD	192	207		100	59	159		103	75	178		136	60	196		33	(15)	18		36	1	37
NON-DEGREE		TOTAL	TOTAL		NEW	CONT	TOTAL		NEW	CONT	TOTAL		NEW	CONT	TOTAL		NEW	CONT	TOTAL		NEW	CONT	TOTAL
	EFL	127	123		52	22	74		52	18	70		57	23	80		5	5	10		5	1	6
	OUS	1,009	965		639	249	888		639	228	867		697	198	895		58	(30)	28		58	(51)	7
	TOTAL	1,136	1,088				962				937				975				38				13
TOTAL UNIVERSITY:		14,166	14,273				14,121				14,652				14,761				109				640

Notes:
All data exclude continuing research and continuous enrollments and the Medical Center.
* This number includes MFA in Interior Design at MVC
** This number is 25 greater than the final projection number -- VPT

VA-CAMPUS FALL 1999 REGISTRATION DATA
End of Sixth Week of Classes--Census

FALL 1999 as of 10/01/99
FALL 1998 as of 10/02/98
IR 10/3/99
[registra]

	Enrollment					Credit Hours					Average Credit Hours	
	Fall 1999	Fall 1998	Change #	Change %	Continuing Research Fall 1999	Fall 1999	Fall 1998	Change #	Change %	Continuing Research Fall 1999	Fall 1999	Fall 1998
CSAS	4	0	4	1.0		21	0	21	1.0		5.2500	0.0000
GSEHD	128	111	17	15.3		810	850	(40)	(4.7)		6.3281	7.6577
SEAS	201	206	(5)	(2.4)	1	1,025	957	68	7.1	1	5.0995	4.6456
SBPM	191	188	3	1.6		1,592	1,649	(57)	(3.5)		8.3351	8.7713
SPHHS	0	1	(1)	(100.0)		0	3	(3)	(100.0)		0.0000	3.0000
Non-degree	28	53	(25)	(47.2)		102	186	(84)	(45.2)		3.6429	3.5094
TOTAL	552	559	(7)	(1.3)	1	3,550	3,645	(95)	(2.6)	1	6.4312	6.5206

OFF-CAMPUS FALL 1999 REGISTRATION DATA*
End of Sixth Week of Classes--Census

FALL 1999 as of 10/01/99
FALL 1998 as of 10/02/98

		Enrollment					Credit Hours					Average Credit Hours	
		Fall 1999	Fall 1998	Change #	Change %	Continuing Research Fall 1999	Fall 1999	Fall 1998	Change #	Change %	Continuing Research Fall 1999	Fall 1999	Fall 1998
CSAS	Undergrad	4	2	2	100.0		20	15	5	33.3		5.0000	7.5000
	Masters	207	203	4	2.0	6	1,439	1,266	173	13.7	6	6.9517	6.2365
	PhD	0	0	0	0.0		0	0	0	0.0		0.0000	0.0000
GSEHD	Masters	551	557	(6)	(1.1)		2,757	2,853	(96)	(3.4)		5.0036	5.1221
	EdD	91	65	26	40.0		451	324	127	39.2		4.9560	4.9846
SEAS	Undergrad	1	0	1	1.0		3	0	3	1.0		3.0000	0.0000
	Masters	487	269	218	81.0	9	2,339	1,293	1,046	80.9	9	4.8029	4.8067
	ScD	14	19	(5)	(26.3)	4	66	73	(7)	(9.6)	4	4.7143	3.8421
SBPM	Undergrad	2	1	1	100.0		15	3	12	400.0		7.5000	3.0000
	Masters	418	346	72	20.8		2,277	2,098	179	8.5		5.4474	6.0636
	PhD	0	0	0	0.0		0	0	0	0.0		0.0000	0.0000
ESIA	Masters	2	0	2	1.0		9	0	9	1.0		4.5000	0.0000
DCE Non-Degree		567	708	(141)	(19.9)		2,317	3,172	(855)	(27.0)		4.0864	4.4802
EFL		1	2	(1)	(50.0)		3	6	(3)	(50.0)		3.0000	3.0000
Totals	Undergrad	7	3	4	133.3		38	18	20	111.1		5.4286	6.0000
	Masters	1,665	1,375	290	21.1	15	8,821	7,510	1,311	17.5	15	5.2979	5.4618
	Doctorates	105	84	21	25.0	4	517	397	120	30.2	4	4.9238	4.7262
	Non-Degree	568	710	(142)	(20.0)		2,320	3,178	(858)	(27.0)		4.0845	4.4761
TOTAL UNIVERSITY		2,345	2,172	173	8.0	19	11,696	11,103	593	5.3	19	4.9876	5.1119
SMHS	Undergrad	625	465	160	34.4		7,446	5,594	1,852	33.1		11.9136	12.0301
	Masters	79	64	15	23.4		556	431	125	29.0		7.0380	6.7344
	HSci-Spec Pgm	34	33	1	3.0		344	401	(57)	(14.2)		10.1176	12.1515
SPHHS	Masters	53	5	48	960.0		195	21	174	828.6		3.6792	4.2000
TOTAL OFF-CAMPUS		3,136	2,739	397	14.5	19	20,237	17,550	2,687	15.3	19	6.4531	6.4074

* Excludes Pace students.
Data exclude Continuing Research and Continuous Enrollments, except where noted.

ON-CAMPUS FALL 1999 REGISTRATION DATA
End of Sixth Week of Classes--Census

FALL 1999 as of 10/01/99
FALL 1998 as of 10/02/98
IR 10/3/99
[registra]

		Enrollment					Credit Hours						
		Fall 1999	Fall 1998	Change #	Change %	Continuing Research Fall 1999	Fall 1999	Fall 1998	Change #	Change %	Continuing Research Fall 1999	Average Fall 1999	Ave. Fall 1998
UG-FT	CSAS	4,171	3,805	366	9.6		63,465	57,943	5,522	9.5		15.2158	15.2281
	SEAS	407	426	(19)	(4.5)		6,219	6,447	(228)	(3.5)		15.2801	15.1338
	SBPM	1,203	1,079	124	11.5		18,019	16,174	1,845	11.4		14.9784	14.9898
	ESIA	1,174	1,075	99	9.2		18,056	16,652	1,404	8.4		15.3799	15.4902
	TOTAL	6,955	6,385	570	8.9		105,759	97,216	8,543	8.8		15.2062	15.2257
UG-PT	CSAS	144	153	(9)	(5.9)		950	1,004	(54)	(5.4)		6.5972	6.5621
	SEAS	47	58	(11)	(19.0)		292	424	(132)	(31.1)		6.2128	7.3103
	SBPM	63	63	0	0.0		459	429	30	7.0		7.2857	6.8095
	ESIA	23	31	(8)	(25.8)		162	203	(41)	(20.2)		7.0435	6.5484
	TOTAL	277	305	(28)	(9.2)		1,863	2,060	(197)	(9.6)		6.7256	6.7541
Masters	CSAS	754	676	78	11.5	48	5,980	5,219	761	14.6	48	7.9310	7.7204
	GSEHD	395	408	(13)	(3.2)	1	2,656	2,543	113	4.4	1	6.7241	6.2328
	SEAS	430	429	1	0.2	2	2,635	2,476	159	6.4	2	6.1279	5.7716
	SBPM	1,569	1,609	(40)	(2.5)	0	12,881	14,416	(1,535)	(10.6)	0	8.2097	8.9596
	ESIA	471	509	(38)	(7.5)	0	3,966	4,317	(351)	(8.1)	0	8.4204	8.4813
	TOTAL	3,619	3,631	(12)	(0.3)	51	28,118	28,971	(853)	(2.9)	51	7.7695	7.9788
Docts	CSAS	599	576	23	4.0	74	4,253	4,163	90	2.2	74	7.1002	7.2274
	GSEHD	214	217	(3)	(1.4)	1	1,175	1,345	(170)	(12.6)	1	5.4907	6.1982
	SEAS	366	373	(7)	(1.9)	28	1,645	1,689	(44)	(2.6)	28	4.4945	4.5282
	SBPM	107	109	(2)	(1.8)	0	711	710	1	0.1	0	6.6449	6.5138
	TOTAL	1,286	1,275	11	0.9	103	7,784	7,907	(123)	(1.6)	103	6.0529	6.2016
LAW	JD-FT	1,215	1,171	44	3.8		17,370	16,946	424	2.5		14.2963	14.4714
	JD-PT	238	237	1	0.4		2,272	2,220	52	2.3		9.5462	9.3671
	Post JD	196	159	37	23.3		1,709	1,287	422	32.8		8.7194	8.0943
NON-DEG	OUS	895	888	7	0.8		4,129	4,107	22	0.5		4.6134	4.6250
	EFL	80	74	6	8.1		579	550	29	5.3		7.2375	7[illegible]
	TOTAL	975	962	13	1.4		4,708	4,657	51	1.1		4.8287	4.[illegible]
TOTAL UNIVERSITY		14,761	14,125	636	4.5	154	169,583	161,264	8,319	5.2	154	11.4886	11.4169
MEDICAL CENTER													
UG-FT	SMHS	46	41	5	12.2		723	679	44	6.5		15.7174	16.5610
	SPHHS	108	96	12	12.5		1,721	1,527	194	12.7		15.9352	15.9063
	TOTAL	154	137	17	12.4		2,444	2,206	238	10.8		15.8701	16.1022
UG-PT	SMHS	5	6	(1)	(16.7)		33	42	(9)	(21.4)		6.6000	7.0000
	SPHHS	5	3	2	66.7		33	18	15	83.3		6.6000	6.0000
	TOTAL	10	9	1	11.1		66	60	6	10.0		6.6000	6.6667
Masters	SMHS	135	121	14	11.6		2,036	1,621	415	25.6		15.0815	13.3967
	SPHHS	474	421	53	12.6	10	3,514	3,277	237	7.2	10	7.4135	7.7838
	TOTAL	609	542	67	12.4	10	5,550	4,898	652	13.3	10	9.1133	9.0369
Doct	SPHHS	23	17	6	35.3		125	112	13	11.6		5.4348	6.5882
MED	MD	605	619	(14)	(2.3)		14,392	15,440	(1,048)	(6.8)		23.7884	24.9435
	MD-Spec Pgm	20	19	1	5.3		175	162	13	8.0		8.7500	8.5263
Non-Deg	HSci-Sp Pgm	3	4	(1)	(25.0)		39	59	(20)	(33.9)		13.0000	14.7500
TOTAL STUDENTS		16,185	15,472	713	4.6	164	192,374	184,201	8,173	4.4	164	11.8859	11.9054

All data exclude continuing research and continuous enrollments, except where noted.

FALL 1999 REGISTRATION DATA
Unduplicated--All Campuses

Fall 1999 as of census
Fall 1998 as of census
10/3/99
[registra]

		Enrollment					Credit Hours						
		Fall 1999	Fall 1998	Change #	Change %	Continuing Research Fall 1999	Fall 1999	Fall 1998	Change #	Change %	Continuing Research Fall 1999	Average Fall 1999	Average Fall 1998
UG-FT	CSAS	4,172	3,806	366	9.6		63,489	57,956	5,533	9.5		15.2179	15.2275
	SEAS	407	427	(20)	(4.7)		6,222	6,459	(237)	(3.7)		15.2875	15.1265
	SBPM	1,204	1,079	125	11.6		18,038	16,186	1,852	11.4		14.9817	15.0009
	ESIA	1,174	1,075	99	9.2		18,056	16,652	1,404	8.4		15.3799	15.4902
	TOTAL	6,957	6,387	570	8.9		105,805	97,253	8,552	8.8		15.2084	15.2267
UG-PT	CSAS	143	152	(9)	(5.9)		946	1,006	(60)	(6.0)		6.6154	6.6184
	SEAS	48	59	(11)	(18.6)		304	421	(117)	(27.8)		6.3333	7.1356
	SBPM	63	63	0	0.0		455	420	35	8.3		7.2222	6.6667
	ESIA	23	31	(8)	(25.8)		162	203	(41)	(20.2)		7.0435	6.5484
	TOTAL	277	305	(28)	(9.2)		1,867	2,050	(183)	(8.9)		6.7401	6.7213
Masters	CSAS	944	854	90	10.5	54	7,440	6,485	955	14.7	54	7.8814	7.5937
	GSEHD	826	858	(32)	(3.7)	1	5,425	5,396	29	0.5	1	6.5678	6.2890
	SEAS	1,035	808	227	28.1	11	5,922	4,633	1,289	27.8	11	5.7217	5.7339
	SBPM	2,113	2,096	17	0.8	0	16,750	18,163	(1,413)	(7.8)	0	7.9271	8.6656
	ESIA	471	509	(38)	(7.5)	0	3,975	4,317	(342)	(7.9)	0	8.4395	8.4813
	TOTAL	5,389	5,125	264	5.2	66	39,512	38,994	518	1.3	66	7.3320	7.6086
Docts	CSAS	599	576	23	4.0	74	4,253	4,163	90	2.2	74	7.1002	7.2274
	GSEHD	412	390	22	5.6	1	2,424	2,519	(95)	(3.8)	1	5.8835	6.4590
	SEAS	393	410	(17)	(4.1)	33	1,776	1,846	(70)	(3.8)	33	4.5191	4.5024
	SBPM	107	109	(2)	(1.8)	0	711	710	1	0.1	0	6.6449	6.5138
	TOTAL	1,511	1,485	26	1.8	108	9,164	9,238	(74)	(0.8)	108	6.0649	6.2209
LAW	JD-FT	1,215	1,171	44	3.8		17,370	16,946	424	2.5		14.2963	14.4714
	JD-PT	238	237	1	0.4		2,272	2,220	52	2.3		9.5462	9.3671
	Post JD	196	159	37	23.3		1,709	1,287	422	32.8		8.7194	8.0943
NON-DEG	DCE	1,451	1,826	(375)	(20.5)		6,548	8,086	(1,538)	(19.0)		4.5127	4.4283
	EFL	80	74	6	8.1		582	556	26	4.7		7.2750	7.5135
	TOTAL	1,531	1,900	(369)	(19.4)		7,130	8,642	(1,512)	(17.5)		4.6571	4.5484
TOTAL UNIVERSITY		17,314	16,769	545	3.3	174	184,829	176,630	8,199	4.6	174	10.6751	10.5331
MEDICAL CENTER													
UG-FT	SMHS	220	179	41	22.9		4,154	3,244	910	28.1		18.8818	18.1229
	SPHHS	108	96	12	12.5		1,721	1,527	194	12.7		15.9352	15.9063
	TOTAL	328	275	53	19.3		5,875	4,771	1,104	23.1		17.9116	17.3491
UG-PT	SMHS	456	336	120	35.7		4,048	3,071	977	31.8		8.8772	9.1399
	SPHHS	5	3	2	66.7		33	18	15	83.3		6.6000	6.0000
	TOTAL	461	339	122	36.0		4,081	3,089	992	32.1		8.8525	9.1121
Masters	SMHS	214	178	36	20.2		2,592	2,052	540	26.3		12.1121	11.5281
	SPHHS	501	425	76	17.9	10	3,709	3,301	408	12.4	10	7.4032	7.7671
	TOTAL	715	603	112	18.6	10	6,301	5,353	948	17.7	10	8.8126	8.8773
Doct	SPHHS	23	17	6	35.3		125	112	13	11.6		5.4348	6.5882
MED	MD	605	619	(14)	(2.3)		14,392	15,440	(1,048)	(6.8)		23.7884	24.9435
	MD-Spec Pgm	20	19	1	5.3		175	162	13	8.0		8.7500	8.5263
Non-Deg	HSci-Sp Pgm	37	37	0	0.0		383	460	(77)	(16.7)		10.3514	12.4324
TOTAL STUDENTS		19,503	18,678	825	4.4	184	216,161	206,017	10,144	4.9	184	11.0835	11.0299

Data exclude continuous enrollments, and continuing research except where noted.

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLES FOX ELLIOTT
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Professor Charles F. Elliott retired this year after a long and fulfilling career teaching courses in Soviet Government and Politics, Soviet Foreign policy and Marxism-Leninism. A graduate from Harvard University and the University of California, Professor Elliott joined the George Washington University (Department of Political Science) in 1964.

As a member of the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies, Professor Elliott was an active facilitator and participant of scholarly discussions concerning Russian national security issues and the Soviet military during the transition period of the 90's. His major publications included *Marxism in the Contemporary West* (with Professor Carl Linden), "Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg and the Dilemma of the Non-Revolutionary Proletariat," "Proletarian Revolution and the Mass Strike," and "Gorbachev's Challenge."

A frequent visitor to the former Soviet Union, Professor Elliott organized and led fourteen student lecture groups to the USSR during his tenure at GWU.

Professor Elliott has also served the university as a regular guest lecturer at the Inter-American Defense College, US Information Agency, National Defense University, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

Professor Elliott spent three years on the Faculty Senate, including one year as chair of the Public Ceremonies Committee and one year as a member of the Educational Policy Committee.

Trusting that Professor Elliott's concern for and contribution to the teaching excellence of the George Washington University will not end with his retirement, we all wish him many more years of fruitful travel, research and lectures in Murmansk, Petrozavodsk, and other Northern cities of Russia.

Joseph Pelzman
Professor of Economics and International Affairs

(Read into the record at the Faculty Senate Meeting, November 12, 1999)

A Tribute to **David Lynn Atkins**
Professor of Biology

David Lynn Atkins retired at the end of the Spring 1999 semester to become Professor Emeritus of Biology. Dr. Atkins earned his BA in Zoology at the University of Texas (Austin) in 1957, and his MS in Zoology at East Texas State in 1963. After teaching science and mathematics in the public high schools in Texas, he returned to school, this time to Texas A&M University, where he earned his PhD in Zoology in 1970 doing research on the comparative anatomy and evolution of the mammal brain working with the renowned evolutionist Lawrence Dillion.

Dr. Atkins joined our faculty in 1970, and in 1978 became a Full Professor. He served on many committees and governing bodies of the University, including the Faculty Senate in the 1970s.

Through his 29 years, Dr. Atkins taught Comparative Vertebrate Anatomy and Neurobiology to numerous biology majors and pre-medical students. He was known as an entertaining lecturer who was clearly in love with the subject of biology. He also had a reputation as a professor with high standards. Many of his colleagues remember a student evaluation on display in his laboratory: the student had not checked any boxes but had instead written in bold marker across the form: "This is one of the toughest, but best, courses at this school!" Dr. Atkins never stopped trying to make his courses better - he pioneered the use of computers in the classroom beginning in the early 1980s and his extensive web site for education in comparative anatomy and the evolution of the brain can still be enjoyed at gwis2.circ.gwu.edu/~atkins.

Diana L. Lipscomb
Professor of Biology

Faculty Senate Meeting
November 12, 1999

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
November 12, 1999
Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair

NONCONCURRENCE

As reported in September, the Executive Committee received a nonconcurrence in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences. The Executive Committee has completed its review of this case and submitted its report, in which the Executive Committee found that the Dean had compelling reasons and provided supporting evidence in his nonconcurrence. A letter to that effect was sent to the department. In accordance with the Faculty Code, the department must now decide whether it wishes to withdraw its recommendation in the light of the Executive Committee's findings.

PROPOSAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION TO BECOME THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

At the request of the Chair of the Department of Public Administration, the Executive Committee had an informational meeting with Professor Newcomer, Chair of the Department of Public Administration, and Dean Lenn, Senior Associate Dean of the School of Business and Public Management. They shared a proposal that the Department of Public Administration become the Graduate School of Public Administration within the School of Business and Public Management. In the context of the Faculty Code, definition of and distinction between schools and departments, the Senate's consistent record of opposition to the concept and establishment of "Schools within Schools", the members of the Executive Committee expressed unequivocal opposition.

The Executive Committee considered this meeting to have been informational only and so informed our two colleagues in the School of Business and Public Management at the outset.

PUBLICATIONS FOR UNIVERSITY CLUB LIBRARY

Please be reminded that faculty members received a memorandum from the Vice President for Academic Affairs regarding the request by the management of the University Club to display copies of publications of GWU Faculty in the New University Club. The contact person is Jody Winter.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Please note that the next meeting of the Executive Committee is November 19th. Resolutions for the Agenda of the December Senate meeting should be submitted to the Executive Committee prior to November 19th.

Please also note that the Millennium Convocation is scheduled for next Tuesday, November 16, at 1:00 p.m. in Lisner Auditorium. Faculty members marching in the procession should meet in in the Lower Lobby of Lisner Auditorium at 12:30 p.m.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, DC

The Faculty Senate **November 1, 1999**

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, November 12, 1999, at 2:10 p.m., in the Sixth Floor Reading Room, Gelman Library.*

AGENDA

1. **Call to order**

2. **Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of September 10, 1999, as distributed**

3. **Introduction of Resolutions**

4. **Report on Final Enrollment Figures by Donald R. Lehman, Vice President for Academic Affairs**

5. **Proposal to create a new College of Professional Studies by Donald R. Lehman, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Roger Whitaker, Associate Vice President for Academic Development and Continuing Education**

6. **Update on Medical Center by John (Skip) Williams, Vice President for Health Affairs, and Dean, School of Medicine and Health Sciences, and Louis H. Katz, Vice President and Treasurer**

7. **General Business:**

   (a) **Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair**

   (b) **Interim Reports of Senate Committee Chairs**

   (c) **Tributes**

***NOTE: Please note location of this meeting.**

8. Brief Statements (and Questions)

9. Adjournment

Brian Selinsky

Brian Selinsky
Secretary